

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are in the case, and the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims as amended.

The Examiner rejected Claims 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Regarding the use of the term “highly doped” semiconductor in Claim 4, this terminology is conventional and well known in the semiconductor industry. Thus, the Applicants believe it is not necessary to further clarify the use of the term “highly doped.” One of skill in the art in the semiconductor field would readily understand the level of doping required to achieve this level of doping. Since at least the early 1960’s this has been well understood as to the quantitative meaning of “highly doped” versus ordinary doping of semiconductors. I have included a copy of an example (Exhibit A) of a section of a textbook published in 2001 discussing “highly doped” semiconductors, thereby establishing the well known meaning of this terminology.

Regarding Claim 8, this has been amended to clarify the meaning and Applicants believe this overcomes the rejection.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Uber (6,414,318). Uber is directed to an electronic circuit for measuring small amounts of charge or small electrical currents. This electronic circuit in Uber, however, requires use of a voltage source which operates to apply a required bias voltage in order to function. For example, see FIG. 1 and the explanation at col. 8, lines 66 and 67 continuing to col. 9, lines 1-9, wherein is described a field generator device 18 (a voltage source) which generates an electric field to drive the charges to be measured from the bias electrode. Further, as stated at col. 9, lines 15-18, a bias voltage is also applied to the circuit. This concept is reiterated in col. 10, lines 23-67 and continuing to col. 11, making it clear that the application of a bias voltage is clearly necessary to operation of the device. The amended claims make it clear that the Applicants’ device does **not** include a bias voltage component to drive a charge sensor but rather is intended to operate as a battery to power a coupled electronic load (see FIG. 4 of the Applicants’ drawings). Uber teaches away from such a device by requiring that the device be operated to generate a bias voltage to accomplish its charge sensing purpose, not to power an

electrical load. The Applicants' invention is thus a new solution to a problem not recognized nor even suggested by Uber.

I view of these amendments and explanation, the Claims 1-12 are now believed to be in condition for allowance. If it would be helpful, the Applicants are available to discuss the invention and this Amendment.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this amendment under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1450. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1450. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1450.

Date:

Feb. 19, 2007

FOLEY & LARDNER

Customer Number: 27433



27433

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Telephone: (312) 832-4586

Facsimile: (312) 832-4700

Respectfully submitted,

By

Michael D. Rechtin

Michael D. Rechtin

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 30,128